

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08970 01 OF 02 131912Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00
CIAE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
-----043123 131935Z /42
P 131756Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0802

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 08970

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 222, JUNE 13, 1978
(SALT TWO - 1782)

REFS: A. SALT TWO-1780 B. SALT TWO-1770

SUMMARY. SOVIETS PROBED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT US INTENTIONS REGARDING CRUISE MISSILES ON SRAM RACKS, NOW AND IN FUTURE. US REPLIED TO EARLIER SOVIET QUESTIONS REGARDING NEED FOR FRODS, RATHER THAN JUST OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES, IF AIRPLANES ONCE CONVERTED TO CRUISE MISSILE CARRIERS ARE LATER RECONVERTED TO OTHER USES. US ALSO CONFIRMED ITS DESIRE FOR SEPARATE COMMON UNDERSTANDING DEFINING FRODS. END SUMMARY.

1. SMOLIN TABLED NEW SOVIET LANGUAGE FOR ART. VI.5, NOTING THAT ACCOUNT HAD BEEN TAKEN ON US COMMENTS AT LAST DRAFTING GROUP (PARA 9 OF REF A). NEW LANGUAGE IS IDENTICAL WITH US FORMULATION EXCEPT FOR SUBSTITUTION OF WORD "BOMBER" FOR "AIRPLANE" AT TWO PLACES IN SECOND SENTENCE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08970 01 OF 02 131912Z

2. SMOLIN AGAIN QUERIED US INTENTIONS REGARDING CRUISE MISSILES ON SRAM LAUNCHERS IN LIGHT OF PEREZ STATEMENT ON JUNE 9 (PARA 1 OF REF A). HE NOTED THAT US HAD SAID THAT CRUISE MISSILES CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR DEPLOYMENT WOULD NOT FIT ON SUCH LAUNCHERS. POSSIBILITY REMAINED THAT OTHER CRUISE MISSILES EXIST WHICH MIGHT FIT ON SRAM LAUNCHERS. THIS WAS NOT HYPOTHETICAL FUTURE SITUATION BUT ONE TAKING

SHAPE NOW. COULD US GIVE CLARIFICATION? ALSO, WITH REGARD TO FUTURE, US SAID IT CANNOT DISCUSS IN SPECIFIC TERMS HYPOTHETICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS. IT IS NOT CLEAR TO SOVIET SIDE WHAT THIS IMPLIES, BUT IT COULD MEAN THAT PROGRAMS MIGHT EXIST IN THE FUTURE WHICH WILL NOT FIT INTO TREATY PROVISIONS ABOUT CRUISE MISSILES. KARPOV ADDED THAT OBJECT OF TALKS IS TO WORK OUT PROVISIONS BLOCKING ANY ACTIVITIES PROHIBITED BY THE TREATY, PROTOCOL OR OTHER DOCUMENTS. SMOLIN CONCLUDED THAT SOVIET CONCERNS RELATED BOTH TO PRESENT AND FUTURE AND THAT THEY WOULD BE GRATEFUL FOR FURTHER EXPLANATIONS.

3. PEREZ REFERRED TO SOVIET QUESTION AT LAST MEETING REGARDING COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO VI.6 ABOUT FRODS, RELATING TO HEAVY BOMBERS AND CRUISE MISSILE CARRIERS, (PARA 10 OF REF A), AND HOW THIS WOULD APPLY TO REVERSE CONVERSION. US VIEW WAS THAT REMOVAL FROM EITHER OR BOTH RELEVANT AGGREGATES SHOULD ONLY BE ON BASIS OF FRODS AND NOT MERELY ON OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF DIFFERENCES DISTINGUISHING THESE AIRPLANES PRIOR TO SUCH REMOVAL. REMOVAL MUST BE CARRIED OUT UNDER PROCEDURES ENSURING THAT SUCH ARMS NO LONGER HAVE CAPABILITY WHICH ORIGINALLY CAUSED THEM TO BE INCLUDED IN AGGREGATE. THIS PROBLEM WAS INHERENTLY MORE DIFFICULT THAN ENSURING THAT ARMS WHICH NEVER HAD A PARTICULAR CAPABILITY HAD NOT ACQUIRED SUCH CAPABILITY. RELIANCE WAS PLACED ON ODS IN
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 08970 01 OF 02 131912Z

ONLY TWO SPECIAL CASES, IN ORDER TO DEAL WITH EXISTING SITUATIONS IN WHICH APPLICATION OF FRODS RULE IS NOT PRACTICAL. THIS EXCEPTION SHOULD BE LIMITED IN ITS APPLICATIONS AND NOT EXTENDED TO MORE DIFFICULT PROBLEM OF ENSURING THAT ARMS WHICH ONCE HAD CERTAIN CAPABILITIES NO LONGER HAVE SUCH CAPABILITIES.

4. KARPOV AND SMOLIN PRESSED FOR FURTHER EXPLANATIONS, WITH LATTER ASKING WHAT US INTERPRETATION WOULD MEAN IN PRACTICE. WHAT SORT OF FRODS COULD BE GIVEN TO RECONVERTED B-52S, WHICH HAD ONCE BEEN CLASSED AS CMCS BECAUSE OF OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES ONLY? IN ABSTRACT TERMS, IF BOMBER X CONVERTED TO X-PRIME, WOULD ITS RECONVERSION MAKE IT X AGAIN OR X-DOUBLE PRIME? PEREZ NOTED THAT SIDE WOULD HAVE CHOICE, IF IT WANTED TO RECONVERT SOME CONVERTED CMCS, EITHER TO DEACTIVATE THEM AND THUS TAKE THEM OUT OF AGGREGATES, OR ELSE GIVE THEM FRODS INDICATING THAT THEY DID NOT HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF PERFORMING AS LONG-RANGE CMCS. SMOLIN ASKED WHY, IF FRODS ARE REQUIRED FOR RECONVERSION, THEY SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED FOR CONVERSION BECAUSE PRINCIPLE IS THE SAME. KARPOV PROBED FOR US VIEWS ON BORDERLINE BETWEEN FRODS AND ODS, WHICH WOULD BE DISTINGUISHABLE BY

NTM. PEREZ NOTED THAT SOVIETS HAD ADOPTED SAME DEFINITION OF FRODS AND THAT THEIR VIEWS SHOULD ALSO BE SET FORTH. HE ALSO COMMENTED THAT PRACTICAL EFFECT OF FRODS REQUIREMENT FOR RECONVERSION MAY BE THAT SIDE WHICH CANNOT PROVIDE FRODS WILL EITHER HAVE TO 1) REMOVE AIRPLANES FROM AGGREGATES VIA DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OR 2) CONVERT THEM TO SOMETHING ELSE NOT INCLUDED IN AGGREGATES, BUT IN THE LATTER CASE, OF COURSE, WITH FRODS.

5. PEREZ REFERRED TO SOVIET SIDE'S VIEW THAT A SEPARATE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08970 02 OF 02 131913Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 CIAE-00 /026 W

-----043152 131935Z /46

P 131756Z JUN 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0803

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 08970

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

PROVISION DEFINING THE TERM "FRODS" APPEARED TO BE UNNECESSARY AND REDUNDANT IN LIGHT OF APPARENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SIDES ON DEFINITION. HOWEVER, RECOGNIZING THAT A CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS DEFINITION OF FRODS IS BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING THE TYPE RULE CONCEPT IN ART. II.3, US CONTINUES TO BELIEVE THIS COMMON UNDERSTANDING IS REQUIRED TO INSURE THAT THERE IS AN EXPLICIT DEFINITION OF THE CONCEPT AND, THEREFORE, THAT IT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE JDT. SMOLIN REPLIED THAT, AS SOVIETS HAD ALREADY SAID IN JUNE 1 PLENARY (REF B), IF US CONTINUES TO INSIST ON INCLUDING ITS PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING, SOVIET SIDE IS PREPARED TO CONSIDER THIS. HE SAID THAT HE FULLY AGREED WITH PEREZ' STATEMENT THAT THERE WERE NO APPARENT DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE SUBSTANCE OF THE FRODS CONCEPT. AS TO DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE SPHERE OF APPLICATION OF FRODS, HE HOPED THAT THEY COULD BE RESOLVED SOON, ADDING THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO DISCUSS SOME EXAMPLES OF FRODS TO ENSURE THAT THERE WERE NO DIFFERENCES OF OPINION.

6. NEXT MEETING THURSDAY, JUNE 15. EARLE

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 jun 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA08970
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780247-0355
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780666/aaaacfp.tel
Line Count: 170
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 8766498a-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1780
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 aug 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2378212
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 222, JUNE 13, 1978 (SALT TWO - 1782)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/8766498a-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014